



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

ATTACHMENT—PROPERTY SUBJECT TO—GOODS CONDITIONALLY SOLD.—Defendant in error, plaintiff below, sold a bill of goods to one Pickard, the terms of the sale being “spot cash.” Shortly after the delivery of the goods, an agent of the defendant in error (the vendor) called upon Pickard and demanded payment. Pickard replied that he would pay as soon as he could take an invoice and check up the shipment. The agent called again some days later, when Pickard told him that he could not pay, and that the defendant in error could take back the goods. To this the agent assented, and went immediately to procure teams and wagons to take back the goods, but on his return he found Pickard’s place of business in the hands of a constable, McIver, the plaintiff in error, who had made a levy upon the said goods by virtue of an attachment in favor of a creditor of the vendee. McIver refused to deliver the goods to the agent, whereupon the defendant in error brought an action of replevin. *Held*, that where goods are sold and delivered upon condition that the title shall not pass to the vendee unless the price agreed upon be paid, the vendee has no attachable interest in the property until the performance of the condition, and the vendor in an action of replevin can recover such goods. *McIver, Constable, et al. v. Williamson-Halsell-Frazier Co.*, (1907), — Okl. —, 92 Pac. Rep. 170.

This case is supported by the clear weight of authority. Where goods are sold on “cash,” the payment of the purchase price is a condition precedent to the passing of title; the delivery is deemed conditional, and the vendor may immediately reclaim or recover the value of the goods. MECHM, SALES, §§ 541-554; *M. C. Railroad Co. v. Phillips*, 60 Ill. 190; *Wabash Elevator Co. v. First National Bank*, 23 Oh. St. 211. Under such circumstances, before the payment of the purchase price, the vendee has no interest which is subject to attachment. *Stevens v. Older*, 25 La. Ann. 634; *Cleveland Machine Works v. Lang*, 67 N. H. 348, 31 Atl. 20; *Goodell v. Fairbrother*, 12 R. I. 233; *Thornton v. Cook*, 97 Ala. 630, 12 So. 403; *Hill v. Freeman*, 57 Mass. (3 CUSH.) 257; *Buchmaster v. Smith*, 22 Vt. 203; *Duncan v. Stone*, 45 Vt. 118; *Am. National Bank v. Lee*, 124 Ga. 863, 53 S. E. 268. The whole question is clearly discussed in *Daugherty v. Fowler*, 44 Kan. 628, 25 Pac. 40, 10 L. R. A. 314.

BANKRUPTCY—RECEIVER AND MANAGER—INSUFFICIENT ESTATE—PRIORITIES—In a debenture-holders’ action to enforce and realize their securities, Smith was appointed receiver and manager. The receiver, in carrying on the business, incurred debts without leave of court or consent of debenture holders, and became bankrupt. The funds in court were insufficient to discharge the costs of realization and the expenses of carrying on the business. The receiver’s trustee in bankruptcy claimed that the funds in court, less the costs of realization, should be paid to him for distribution among the receivership creditors; while the plaintiffs contended that the receiver, since he acted improperly, was not entitled to indemnity out of the assets, but that the funds, less the costs of realization, should be distributed among the debenture